

3.13 POPULATION AND HOUSING

This section provides baseline data on the existing population and housing characteristics of the City, including the project area. The scope of potentially significant population and housing changes resulting from implementation of the proposed project are evaluated in the impact analysis discussion of this section. The description of existing conditions (Subsection 3.13.1) provides an overview of La Cañada Flintridge's population growth trends and related changes in the housing needs of the project area and the City. The data used in this section was obtained from various sources, including the United States Bureau of the Census, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the California Department of Finance, and the City of La Cañada Flintridge General Plan Housing Element. In addition, the Initial Study determined that analysis is not required for impacts associated with the displacement of people or housing, as the project site is currently vacant and will not result in the need for replacement housing.

3.13.1 Environmental Setting

Population, housing, and employment data are available on a city, county, regional, and state level. For the purpose of this EIR, data was collected and provided at the city and county level in an effort to focus the analysis specifically on the City of La Cañada Flintridge. The information contained within this section is largely based on information from the U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance, and SCAG. These sources and documents are hereby incorporated by reference for data provide within the following texts and tables.

The proposed residential uses, referred to as the La Cañada Flintridge Tentative Tract 53647, on the project site include 18 lots composed of 17 residential parcels and one additional, larger open space/conservation lot.

■ Population

Growth Trends

As illustrated in Table 3.13-1, during the last 12 years, the City has experienced a total population increase of 8 percent. Table 3.13-1 shows the population growth of La Cañada Flintridge since 1990. Between 1990 and 2000, the population of La Cañada Flintridge increased from 19,378 to 20,318 persons. The most recently published population of La Cañada Flintridge (2002) is 20,946 persons, which indicates a 3.1 percent increase from 2000.

Table 3.13-1 Population Growth

<i>Year</i>	<i>Populations</i>	<i>Increase (%)</i>	<i>Average Annual Growth (persons per year)</i>	<i>Average Annual Growth Rate (%)</i>
1990	19,378	—	—	—
2000	20,318	4.9%	94	0.5%
2002	20,946	3.1%	314	1.5%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance

In comparison, Palmdale, the fastest growing large city in California, grew at a rate of 460 percent between the years 1980 and 1990.

Households

A household is defined by the U.S. Census as a group of people who occupy a housing unit. A household differs from a dwelling unit because the number of dwelling units includes vacant dwelling units. It is important to note that not all of the population lives in households; a portion lives in group quarters, such as board and care facilities, while others are homeless.

Household Size

Small households (1-2 persons per household) traditionally reside in units with 0-2 bedrooms, while family households (3-4 persons per household) normally reside in units with 3-4 bedrooms. Large households (5 or more persons per household) reside in units with 4 or more bedrooms. However, the number of units in relation to the household size may also reflect preference and economics. Thus, many small households prefer, and obtain, larger units. Conversely, some large families live in small units for purely economic reasons.

As seen in Table 3.13-2, the City had 6,823 households, with a household population of 20,129 in 2000. By 2002, the number of households had grown to 6,862 an increase of 0.5 percent. During the same period, the household population grew to 20,757, representing an increase of 3.1 percent.

Average household size fluctuates due to many factors. From 1990 to 2002, the average household size increased from 2.87 persons per household (pph) to 3.025 pph. Although La Cañada Flintridge's average household size has increased, it is lower than the average household size for Los Angeles County (3.058 pph) and the State of California (2.916 pph).

Table 3.13-2 Household Size

<i>Year</i>	<i>Total City Household Population¹</i>	<i>Percent Change in City Household Population per Year</i>	<i>Total Number of Households²</i>	<i>Percent Change in Total Number of Households</i>	<i>Household Size (pph)³</i>
1990	19,212	—	6,694	—	2.870
2000	20,129	4.8%	6,823	1.9%	2.950
2002	20,757	3.1%	6,862	0.5%	3.025

1. Household Population = Total Population - Population living in Group Quarters or Homeless

2. Number of Households = Number of Occupied Housing Units

3. Household Size = Household Population / Number of Households

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance

Housing

Growth Trends

A city's housing market is driven by supply and demand. Many factors influence the market, including population growth, income, housing cost, and housing locations. However, age distribution is a key market characteristic because housing demand within the market is influenced by the housing preference of certain age groups. Due to limited income, the majority of the young adult population (20- to 34-years-old) tends to occupy apartments, low- to moderate-cost condominiums, and smaller single-family units. The 35- to 65-year-old group provides the market for moderate- to high-cost apartments and condominiums and larger single-family units because, on average, people of this age group have higher incomes and large household sizes. For the elderly population (65 years of age and up), housing demands are similar to young adults, but also include group quarters and mobile homes as housing options. Table 3.13-3 provides a breakdown of the types of housing units in La Cañada Flintridge in 1990 and 2000.

**Table 3.13-3 Total Number of Housing Units
(Defined by Units per Structure)**

Year	Single-Family ¹	Two to Four Units	Five or More	Mobile Homes/ Other	Total Number of Units	Occupied Units
1990	6,659	73	184	2	6,918	6,694
2000	6,670	132	175	0	6,977	6,806

1. Includes Single Family Detached and Attached Units

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance

Type of Housing Stock

In 1990, the total number of dwelling units in the City was 6,918 units as compared to 6,989 units in 2000. The 2000 breakdown for housing by type is

- 95.6 percent single family (down from 96.3 percent in 1990)
- 1.9 percent duplex, triplex, and four-plex (up from 1.1 percent in 1990)
- 2.5 percent multiple family (down from 2.7 percent in 1990)
- 0 percent mobile home or other type of dwelling unit (down from 0.03 percent in 1990)

These percentages are derived from the data presented in Table 3.13-3.

Further data extrapolation from Table 3.13-3 indicates that the housing stock grew by approximately 0.9 percent from 1990 to 2000, or 5.9 units per year, while the population grew by 94 persons per year, or 0.5 percent per year. The decrease in five or more unit structures is accompanied by a corresponding increase in two- to four-unit structures, as well as single-family units, which in part could reflect a number of conversions from apartments to condominiums. Due to its proximity to downtown Los Angeles, the City has become a popular community that provides a mixture of urban, suburban, and rural-like uses. This accounts for the increase in the housing supply.

Vacancy Rate

The vacancy rates and affordability of the housing stock are also key elements in the balance between supply and demand in the City's housing market. High vacancy rates usually indicate low demand and/or high prices in the housing market. Conversely, low vacancy rates usually indicate high demand and/or low prices in the housing market. However, vacancy rates are not the sole indicator of market conditions. They must be viewed in the context of all the characteristics of the local and regional market and economy.

Vacancy rates which indicate a "market balance" (a condition where rates indicate a reasonable level of vacancy) generally range from 1 percent to 3 percent for single-family units, and from 3 percent to 5 percent for multi-family units. In 2000 and 2002, the City's vacancy rates were much lower than the vacancy rate of the County of Los Angeles (4.19 percent) for both owner- and renter-occupied housing at 2.38 percent. Table 3.13-4 provides the vacancy rates in the City in 1990, 2000, and 2002.

Table 3.13-4 Vacancy Rate for the City of La Cañada Flintridge			
<i>Vacant Units</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2002</i>
Total Vacancy Rate	3.24%	2.38%	2.38%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance

It should be noted that the total vacancy rates include vacant units that are not available for rent or sale. This includes units that are for rent for occasional, seasonal, or recreational purposes; units that have been rented or sold, but have not yet been occupied as of the date of the census; and units being held for repairs/modernization or for personal reasons of the owner (i.e., probate). Ultimately, these units should not be included in the vacancy rate because they are not on the market and are not available for rental or purchase. In addition, the vacant rental units should include both assisted and unassisted living units, as well as units available only to senior citizens.

Table 3.13-5 shows the tenure of owner-occupied housing units versus renter-occupied housing units for the City. As shown by SCAG data, 9.4 percent of the housing stock was renter-occupied, while 90.6 percent of the La Cañada Flintridge housing stock was owner-occupied.

Table 3.13-5 Renter-Occupied Housing vs. Owner-Occupied Housing		
<i>Units</i>	<i>Renter Occupied</i>	<i>Owner Occupied</i>
Total Housing Units	639	6,162

Source: SCAG

Housing Cost

Although an assessment of "housing needs" includes such components as total unit numbers, types, age, and vacancy rates, the most overwhelming problem facing the City is housing cost. This problem is shared throughout the Southern California market. Table 3.13-6 identifies median rental costs and home values in the city.

Table 3.13-6 Median Home Values and Rents

	<i>2000 Median Rent</i>	<i>2000 Median Value</i>
La Cañada Flintridge	\$1,148	\$587,800

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, California Department of Finance

The 2000 Census includes information on housing unit value and gross rent. In 2000, the median value of owner-occupied housing units in the City was \$587,800. It is important to mention that median housing value, as estimated by housing owners, is usually higher than the actual median housing sales price. The median gross monthly rent for the City was \$1,148 in 2000.

California's Housing Element law requires that each city and county, when preparing its State-mandated Housing Element of a General Plan, must develop local housing programs designed to meet its "fair share" of existing and future housing needs for all income groups, as determined by the jurisdiction's Council of Governments. This "fair share" allocation concept seeks to ensure that each jurisdiction accepts responsibility for the housing needs of not only its resident population, but also for those households who might reasonably be expected to reside within the jurisdiction, particularly lower-income households, were there a variety and choice of housing accommodations appropriate to their needs.

In the six-county southern California region, the agency responsible for assigning these fair share targets to each jurisdiction is the SCAG. The fair share allocation process begins with the State Department of Finance's projection of statewide housing demand for a five-year planning period, which is then apportioned by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) among each of the State's official regions. Councils of Government, such as SCAG, then further allocate their assigned regional shares among its member jurisdictions. For more than two years, SCAG staff, the SCAG subregions (including the Arroyo Verdugo Subregion, to which La Cañada Flintridge belongs) worked to prepare the jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction estimates of "total construction need" for the 1998–2005 planning period and the distribution of this construction need across four household income categories. SCAG's process of adopting the 1999 Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) concluded in November 2000. Table 3.13-7 shows the 1999 RHNA allocation for the City of La Cañada Flintridge. It calls for 133 units of housing over a 7½-year period. La Cañada Flintridge's RHNA allocation is based, in part, on SCAG's regional growth forecast to 2025, which was prepared for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan Update.

Table 3.13-7 City of Pasadena RHNA Needs by Income Category

<i>Income</i>	<i>Housing</i>	<i>Unit Needs</i>	<i>Proposed Project Units</i>
Very Low	20 Units	15%	0
Low	15 Units	11%	0
Moderate	21 Units	16%	0
Above Moderate	77 Units	58%	17
Total	133 Units	100%	17

Source: SCAG

The recent population, household, and employment (employment generated from businesses located within La Cañada Flintridge) forecasts provided in Table 3.13-8 for the City and the Arroyo Verdugo Subregion were prepared by SCAG in November 2000.

Table 3.13-8 SCAG Population, Housing, and Employment Forecast					
	2005	2010	2015	2020	2025
ARROYO VERDUGO SUBREGION					
Population	427,251	438,659	449,889	465,122	480,856
Households	152,388	158,068	163,768	170,209	180,070
Employment	226,334	241,792	250,935	259,288	268,174
CITY OF LA CAÑADA FLINTRIDGE					
Population	21,359	21,485	21,608	21,779	21,954
Households	6,888	6,936	6,987	7,042	7,128
Employment	12,795	13,310	13,614	13,893	14,190

Source: SCAG, 2001 RTP Update

3.13.2 Regulatory Framework

■ Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

SCAG's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) is the major tool for coordinating local housing development strategies in southern California. State Housing Law mandates that local governments, through Councils of Governments, identify existing and future housing needs in a RHNA. SCAG RHNA policies related to population and housing that are applicable to the proposed project are listed below and are analyzed for project consistency in Subsection 3.10.5. Applicable policies from the Growth Management Chapter (GMC) of the RHNA include

- Policy 3.04 Encourage local jurisdictions' efforts to achieve a balance between the types of jobs they seek to attract and housing prices.
- Policy 3.09 Support provisions and incentives created by local jurisdictions to attract housing growth in job rich subregions and job growth in housing subregions.
- Policy 3.11 Support provisions and incentives created by local jurisdictions to attract housing growth in job rich subregions and job growth in housing rich subregions.
- Policy 3.24 Encourage efforts of local jurisdictions in the implementation of programs that increase the supply and quality of housing and provide affordable housing as evaluated in the RHNA.

Consistency: The proposed project will construct 17 residential lots with buildable pads for above moderate-income housing units. As seen in Table 3.13-8, SCAG predicts that over the next 20 years, the amount of housing will remain lower than the number of jobs within La Cañada Flintridge. Therefore, although the project is anticipated

to ultimately lead to an increased number of housing units and residents within La Cañada Flintridge while not providing any direct employment, this increase is consistent with SCAG's projection for La Cañada Flintridge and Policy 3.04. The grading of the buildable pads would create short-term temporary employment. However, the proposed project is a division and grading of pads for future housing construction and would not result in any permanent employment opportunities within the City. However, this increase is consistent with SCAG's projections for La Cañada Flintridge (see Table 3.13-8). As seen in Table 3.13-8, the City of La Cañada Flintridge, as well as the San Gabriel Valley Subregion, is estimated to have more employment than housing over the next 20 years. Therefore, the proposed project will be providing buildable pads for housing growth to a job-rich subregion. Furthermore, because residential growth instigates commercial growth, the proposed project's 17 residential lots with buildable pads for above moderate-income housing units would provide 22 percent of the 77 above moderate-income housing unit needs for the City. Table 3.13-7 shows that the most recent housing needs projected for La Cañada Flintridge by SCAG requires that 58 percent of the total new housing units be above moderate income housing units. Therefore, due to the need for above moderate-income housing in La Cañada Flintridge, the proposed project would be in compliance with this Policy.

3.13.3 Thresholds of Significance

Implementation of the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts if any of the following would occur:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses), or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)

3.13.4 Impacts

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Population Increase in Excess of Planned Growth

A project that would increase the population of a city outside of its planned growth is considered to have a potentially significant impact. The project proposes 17 single-family residential lots on 47.11 acres of land. Approval of the proposed project and the associated buildout of the residential units are estimated to increase the population of the City by 51 persons (based on the most recent 2002 estimated rate of 3.025 persons per household). Based on the 2002 population of the City at 20,946 persons, an increase of 51 persons accounts for a 0.2 percent increase in population. Based on current project completion projections, it is assumed that all of the residential units would be occupied by the year 2008, when the population is estimated to exceed 21,359 persons at current growth rates. The project-generated 51 persons accounts for an estimated 4.4 percent of the potential projected population increase between the years 2000 and 2010. This fractional population growth directly resulting from the proposed project is consistent with the anticipated growth for the City, as well as the Arroyo Verdugo Subregion, estimated by SCAG. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

■ Potentially Significant Impacts

There are no potentially significant population or housing impacts as a result of the proposed project.

3.13.5 Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

No measures are recommended to further reduce the less-than-significant impacts associated with population and housing.

3.13.6 Cumulative Impacts

As seen in Table 3.13-2, the most recent persons per household ratio within the City is 3.025 (2002). This factor, applied to the total number of cumulative housing projects in the City of La Cañada Flintridge (total of 28 residential units, including the proposed project's 17 residential units), results in an estimated population increase of 91. As discussed in the impact discussion, associated buildout of the residential units is estimated to increase the population of the City by 51 persons (based on the most recent 2002 estimated rate of 3.025 persons per household). As seen in Table 3.13-1, the most recent population of La Cañada Flintridge is 20,946. Table 3.13-8 indicates that SCAG projections are currently higher than the actual and projected population of La Cañada Flintridge. Therefore, the effect of the housing and residential lot developments contained within the cumulative project list would be considered less than significant. The effect of the La Cañada Flintridge Tentative Tract 53647 Development Project alone is not considered significant, even though it accounts for 56 percent of the total cumulative projected population increase, because the project area is considered one of the last developable parcels within the City. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to contribute significantly to the cumulative impact on population in the project area.

3.13.7 References

California. Department of Finance. 2003a. *City/County Population and Housing Elements, April 1, 1990*. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/>, January.

———. Department of Finance. 2003b. *Official U.S. Census Counts as of April 1, 2000*. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/>, January.

———. Department of Finance. 2003c. *Official State Estimates as of January 1, 2002*. <http://www.dof.ca.gov/>, January.

La Cañada Flintridge, City of. 1993. *General Plan*. Adopted 15 November.

Southern California Association of Governments. 2000. *SCAG Population, Housing, and Employment Forecasts*.

———. 2001. *2001 Regional Transportation Plan Update*.

———. 2003a. *Adopted RHNA Construction Need (Nov. '00): Final Adopted Numbers by Income*, January.

———. 2003b. *SCAG RHNA99: Adopted Existing Need—All Incomes Housing Problems Detail*, January.

United States Census Bureau. 2003a. *Profile of General Demographic Characteristics: 2000 for La Cañada Flintridge City, California*. <http://www.census.gov/>, January.

———. 2003b. *Profile of Selected Housing Characteristics: 2000 for La Cañada Flintridge City, California*. <http://www.census.gov/>, January.

3.14 UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

This section evaluates the effects on utilities and service systems related to implementation of the proposed project by identifying anticipated demand and existing and planned utility availability. For purposes of this EIR, utilities include domestic water supply, solid waste collection and disposal, wastewater conveyance and treatment, electricity, and natural gas. Stormwater drainage facilities are discussed in Section 3.07 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of this document. Impacts of the proposed project with regard to soils capable of accommodating the proposed septic systems on the five lots are analyzed in Section 3.05 (Geology).

Data used in the preparation of this section were taken from various sources, including previous environmental documentation prepared for the City of La Cañada Flintridge and by contacting utility providers. Full bibliographic entries for all reference materials are provided in Subsection 3.14.5 (References), below.

Comment letters were received from Southern California Edison and The Gas Company in response to the Notice of Preparation circulated for the project related to utilities.

This section analyzes only those environmental issue areas related to utilities that result in less-than-significant or potentially significant impacts. The Initial Study/Notice of Preparation identifies several areas that would result in no impacts and would not require evaluation in the EIR. The following represents a list of those areas that are found not to be significant and are not analyzed further in this EIR.

- Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Wastewater treatment for the project area is the responsibility of the County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County for that portion of the project discharging into City of Pasadena sewer trunk lines.
- The proposed project would comply with all federal, State, and local statutes and regulations pertaining to solid waste.
- In response to the Initial Study/Notice of Preparation, a comment letter was received from The Gas Company. The Gas Company indicated that gas service could be provided without significant impact on the environment from various existing medium-pressure mains in surrounding streets. It anticipates no environmental issues related to provision of gas service to the project.
- The project site is currently within the service boundaries of Pacific Bell (now known as SBC). SBC, since the mid-1960s, has placed most of its utility lines underground, and most of the lines currently within the City are underground. SBC is anticipated to be able to provide adequate telephone service to the proposed project with extension of telephone utility infrastructure.

3.14.1 Environmental Setting

The proposed project is located in the southern portion of the City of La Cañada Flintridge in the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains, north of Glendale and west of Pasadena. The property consists of 47 acres of hillside property, bounded by Inverness Drive/Haverstock Road to the north, Saint Katherine Drive to the east, Palmerstone Drive to the south, and properties off Monarch Drive to the west. The site is currently undeveloped.

The applicant proposes to divide the property into 18 lots ranging in size from 0.92 acre to 18.36 acres, consisting of 17 single-family residential lots and one conservation (open space) lot. The topography of the site is extremely hilly, with an average slope of 48 percent. The site is surrounded by single-family residential on all sides. Various public utilities, services, and facilities would need to be provided to the project site to support the residential development.

■ Water Supply and Treatment

Valley Water Company provides water service to approximately 9,700 people in the eastern section of the City of La Cañada Flintridge, bordering Pasadena to the east and Glendale to the south. Valley Water is subject to the regulations of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Department of Health Services for water treatment.

Valley Water is entitled to withdraw 797 acre-feet (259.7 million gallons) from the Raymond Basin annually, approximately 35 percent of its water supply, via four wells. The remaining 65 percent is purchased from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD), a regional wholesaler of imported surface water. This water is a blend of Colorado River water delivered through MWD's Colorado River Aqueduct and surface water from Northern California delivered through the State of California Water Project Aqueduct. MWD's water is filtered and disinfected at the Weymouth Filtration Plant in La Verne, California.

Valley Water is required by the California Department of Health Services to test well water for organic chemicals, minerals, metals, and bacterial. In addition, it is required to test regularly for bacteria and trihalomethanes in the distribution system. Lead and copper are tested in tap water from selected residences. In 1993, Valley Water constructed an Air Stripping treatment plant to remove the volatile organic solvents such as perchloroethylene (PCE) below detectable levels. PCE and other volatile organic chemicals in treated water are monitored each week. Chlorine disinfectant is added to all water delivered by Valley Water to kill microorganisms and prevent regrowth of bacteria in storage reservoirs and distribution pipelines.

The Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County operate ten water reclamation plants (WRPs) and one ocean discharge facility (Joint Water Pollution Control Plant), which treat approximately 520 million gallons per day, 190 mgd of which are available for reuse. The San Jose Creek WRP is the largest of the water reclamation plants. The La Cañada Water Reclamation Plant, located at 533 Meadowview Drive, La Cañada Flintridge, occupies approximately 0.33 acre on the grounds of the La Cañada Flintridge Country Club and provides extended aeration secondary treatment for 200,000 gallons of wastewater per day. The plant serves the 425 homes surrounding the Country Club. All of the disinfected, secondary effluent is put into the four lakes on the 105-acre golf course. Lake water (augmented by potable water during the summer) is used for landscape irrigation of the golf course.

In 2001, Valley Water distributed 3,648 acre-feet of water to its customers, equivalent to nearly 1.2 billion gallons. Valley Water participates in the MWD's Seasonal Storage Program. During the months of May through October, Valley Water pumps approximately 500 acre-feet of groundwater and mixes it with imported water purchased from MWD.

■ Solid Waste

La Cañada Flintridge is served primarily by two Class III (non-hazardous) landfills: the Scholl Canyon Landfill and the Puente Hills Landfill, both operated by the County Sanitation Districts. Waste is picked up in the City by private haulers under contract with the City, who then transport the waste to the landfills. The permitted capacity of the Scholl Canyon Landfill is 69 million cubic yards and, as of November 2002, has a remaining permitted capacity of 18.2 million cubic yards (approximately 35 billion tons). Estimated closure date is 2020. Permitted capacity of the Puente Hills Landfill is 106 million cubic yards, with a remaining capacity as of November 2002 of 20 million cubic yards (approximately 38 billion tons). Estimated closure date is 2020.

In 2001, the City of La Cañada Flintridge generated a total of 41,397 tons of solid waste; approximately 36,496 tons went to landfills and 8,366 tons were diverted from the waste stream through recycling or provided as biodegradable cover for landfills (green waste or construction/demolition waste). Residential waste accounted for 11,591 tons. Of the total, approximately 45 percent was diverted from the waste stream¹. The City has a mandatory green waste separation program effective April 2000 that mandates placement of all green waste in a separate container for curbside collection. The City provides curbside recyclable and household hazardous waste collection as well. For public spaces, grass cycling is implemented, where grass is not allowed to grow past a certain specified height before it is mowed, and the clippings are left on the ground and allowed to mulch rather than be disposed of. Tree trimmings from City-owned property is chipped, mulched, or trimmed as wood for other uses.

■ Wastewater

The City of La Cañada Flintridge has historically been on a septic system for disposal of wastewater. The City has approved two sewer assessment districts, one of which has been completed. Additional sewer assessment districts are proposed but have not yet been approved. A fifth sewer assessment district would include the project site, but is not anticipated to be approved and constructed until approximately 2008. Westerly portions of the project site are adjacent to an 8-inch City of Pasadena sewer trunk line that traverses Via Serrano from Sacred Heart School, along Saint Katherine to Inverness, then east on Inverness to its outfall in the City of Pasadena. The City of Pasadena is currently repairing this line and will transfer responsibility for maintenance to the County Sanitation Districts when repairs are completed. Eighty percent of wastewater flows through the sewer system in La Cañada Flintridge flows through County Sanitation Districts' trunk lines; the remaining 20 percent of wastewater drains through City of Los Angeles wastewater conveyance lines in Glendale. Pursuant to written agreement, the City of La Cañada Flintridge purchased remaining capacity in the Linda Visa/Arroyo Boulevard Trunk Sewer from the City of Pasadena in the amount of 3.43 cubic feet per second.

¹ Data for 2001 have not yet been approved by the California Integrated Waste Management Board. In 2000, the last year for which approval has been obtained, the City diverted 42 percent of the waste stream through recycling.

■ Electricity

Electricity is supplied to the City of La Cañada Flintridge by Southern California Edison. Electric distribution infrastructure is not currently in place on the project site and new infrastructure will be needed to accommodate the new development.

■ Natural Gas

Natural gas is provided by the Southern California Gas Company, which provides medium-pressure gas mains in streets surrounding the project site.

■ Telephone

SBC provides telephone service to the City, including the project site. A system of underground cabling is currently located underneath the adjacent land uses and extension of this infrastructure would be required throughout the project site.

3.14.2 Regulatory Framework

■ Water Supply

Federal

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (CWA) was designed to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Nation's waters. The CWA also directs states to establish water quality standards for all "waters of the United States" and to review and update such standards on a triennial basis. Other provisions of the CWA related to basin planning include Section 208, which authorizes the preparation of waste treatment management plans, and Section 319, which mandates specific actions for the control of pollution from non-point sources. The EPA has delegated responsibility for implementation of portions of the CWA to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), including water quality control planning and control programs, such as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program.

Section 303 of the CWA requires states to adopt water quality standards for all surface waters of the United States. Section 304(a) requires the EPA to publish water quality criteria that accurately reflect the latest scientific knowledge on the kind and extent of all effects on health and welfare that may be expected from the presence of pollutants in water. Where multiple uses exist, water quality standards must protect the most sensitive use. Water quality standards are typically numeric, although narrative criteria based upon biomonitoring methods may be employed where numerical standards cannot be established or where they are needed to supplement numerical standards.

Section 303(c)(2)(b) of the CWA requires states to adopt numerical water quality standards for toxic pollutants for which EPA has published water quality criteria and which reasonably could be expected to interfere with designated uses in a water body.

All projects resulting in discharges, whether to land or water, are subject to Section 13263 of the California Water Code and are required to obtain approval of Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) by the RWQCBs. Land and groundwater-related WDRs (i.e., non-NPDES WDRs) regulate discharges of privately or publicly treated domestic wastewater and process and wash-down wastewater. WDRs for discharges to surface waters also serve as NPDES permits, which are further described below.

State

Responsibility for the protection of water quality in California rests with the SWRCB and nine RWQCBs. The SWRCB establishes statewide policies and regulations for the implementation of water quality control programs mandated by federal and State water quality statutes and regulations. The RWQCBs develop and implement Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) that consider regional beneficial uses, water quality characteristics, and water quality problems. The Los Angeles Basin Plan implements a number of federal and State laws, the most important of which are the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act and the Federal Clean Water Act. For a discussion of these regulations see Section 3.08, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of this EIR.

Urban Water Management Planning Act (California Water Code, Division 6, Part 2.6, Section 10610 et seq.)

The Urban Water Management Planning Act was developed due to concerns for potential water supply shortages throughout the State of California. It requires information on water supply reliability and water use efficiency measures. Urban water suppliers are required, as part of the Act, to develop and implement Urban Water Management Plans to describe efforts to promote efficient use and management of water resources.

■ Solid Waste

State

At the State level, the management of solid waste is governed by regulations established by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), which delegates local permitting, enforcement, and inspection responsibilities to Local Enforcement Agencies (LEA). In 1997, some of the regulations adopted by the State Water Quality Control Board pertaining to landfills (Title 23, Chapter 15) were incorporated with CIWMB regulations (Title 14) to form Title 27 of the California Code of Regulations.

AB 939—California Integrated Waste Management Act

In 1989, the Legislature adopted the California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989. The Act requires that each county prepare a new Integrated Waste Management Plan. The Plan was required to include a Source Reduction and Recycling Element prepared by each city within the State by July 1, 1991. Each source reduction

element included a schedule providing for source reduction, recycling, or composing of 25 percent of solid waste in the jurisdiction by January 1, 1995, and 50 percent by January 1, 2000. SB 2202 (Senate Environmental Quality Committee 2000) made a number of changes to the municipal solid waste diversion requirements under the Integrated Waste Management Act. These changes included a revision to the statutory requirement for 50 percent diversion of solid waste to clarify that local governments shall continue to divert 50 percent of all solid waste on and after January 1, 2000.

SB 1374 (Kuehl)

Senate Bill 1374 requires local agencies to adopt an ordinance, not later than September 1, 2005, requiring not less than a 75 percent diversion of construction and demolition waste materials from landfills.

■ **Wastewater**

Federal

The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program also requires establishment of an industrial pretreatment program to prevent the release of industrial waste discharges to publicly owned treatment works, such as the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP).

State

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act (Water Code Sections 13000 et seq.) establishes the State Water Resources Control Board and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards as the principal State agencies for having primary responsibility in coordinating and controlling water quality in California. The regional boards are responsible for issuing waste discharge permits pursuant to the NPDES. Section 13260 of the Water Code specifically requires the campus to file a report of waste discharge with the appropriate regional board.

The quality of effluent that can be discharged from the HTP is established by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) through an NPDES permit that specifies Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs). Operation of the HTP is subject to regulations set forth by the California Department of Health Services (DHS) and State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

Local

The applicant will be required to obtain all required permits pertaining to wastewater systems from the Los Angeles County Health Department prior to project approval.

■ **Electricity**

There are no federal or State regulations pertaining to electricity.

■ Natural Gas

There are no federal or State regulations pertaining to natural gas.

Local

Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Policy 3.05 | Encourage patterns of urban development and land use which reduce costs on infrastructure construction and make better use of existing facilities. |
| Policy 3.09 | Support local jurisdictions' efforts to minimize the cost of infrastructure and public service delivery, and efforts to seek new sources of funding for development and the provision of services. |

Consistency: The proposed project would utilize some existing infrastructure as well as provide new infrastructure in areas that it is currently insufficient at no cost to the City. This would be consistent with the above policies.

3.14.3 Thresholds of Significance

In general, project impacts on public services would be considered significant if project-induced population growth or concentration of population exceeds the capacity of existing or planned infrastructure or public service facilities. The criteria used for analysis of proposed project impacts to public services and utilities are listed below, pursuant to Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines:

- Require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects
- Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or need new or expanded entitlements
- Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs
- Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste
- Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments

3.14.4 Impacts

■ Less-Than-Significant Impacts

Water Demand

An increase in domestic water use would occur as a result of the proposed project. The typical southern California home uses 384 gallons of water daily, indoors and out. Because of the low-density residential that is predominant in the La Cañada Flintridge area, water usage on average is approximately 400 gallons per day, due to large lots with plenty of landscape irrigation during the warm months. The average apartment or condominium uses 256 gallons daily. An individual uses between 100 and 140 gallons of water each day. Table 3.14-1 and Table 3.14-2 depict typical indoor and outdoor residential water use. Water demand, as shown in Table 3.14-3, is estimated using a residential factor of 400 gallons of water per dwelling unit per day, which includes personal use, as well as average residential landscape watering. It is assumed in this analysis, as a worst-case scenario, that all open space would be irrigated, and a demand factor of 2,740 gallons per day per acre is estimated using Los Angeles County Planning Department estimates.

Inside the house, typical activities use water as follows:

Table 3.14-1 Typical Residential Water Usage	
Activity	Water Usage
Bath	20 gallons
Shower	40 gallons every 10 minutes
Washing, etc. at Bathroom Sink	3 gallons per person each day
Cooking & Drinking	5 gallons per person each day
Dishwashing	15 gallons per load
Laundry	45 gallons per load
Flushing Toilets	28 gallons per person each day

Source: www.cvwd.com/pages/average.htm

Outside the house, typical activities use water as follows:

Table 3.14-2 Typical Outdoor Residential Water Usage	
Activity	Water Usage¹
Lawn	18.0 gallons per square foot annually
Bedding Plants/Shrubs/Trees	7.5 gallons per square foot annually
Vegetable Garden & Fruit Trees	10.0 gallons per square foot annually
Swimming Pool Evaporation—Summer	32.0 gallons per square foot
Swimming Pool Evaporation—Winter	10.0 gallons per square foot
Hosing Driveway	150.0 gallons
Washing Car	150.0 gallons

Table 3.14-2 Typical Outdoor Residential Water Usage

<i>Activity</i>	<i>Water Usage¹</i>
1. The data are national averages and are used only to show relative differences. Landscape water demand varies with local climate, plant selection, and sun/shade exposure. Swimming pool evaporation is for uncovered pools...up to 95 percent of that evaporation is eliminated with a pool cover.	
Source: www.cvwd.com/pages/average.htm	

Table 3.14-3 depicts estimated water demand for the proposed project.

Table 3.14-3 Estimated Water Demand

<i>Use</i>	<i>Units</i>	<i>Use Factor</i>	<i>Water Demand (gpd) Average</i>
Residential	17 DU	400 gpd/DU	6,800
Open Space		2,740 gpd/acre	250,984
Total			425,634

Source: L.A. County Planning Department Urban Services Analysis, March 1999

Approximately 65 percent of the City's water supply is provided by purchases by Valley Water Company from the MWD. The remaining 35 percent comes from wells owned and operated by the Valley Water Company. Valley Water Company has provided a Statement of Water Availability dated October 15, 2001, that indicates that it can deliver water to the proposed project for domestic and fire protection purposes. The MWD, in its February 2002 Report on Metropolitan's Water Supplies, states that its existing supply capabilities can meet 100 percent of its member agencies' projected supplemental demands over the next 20 years in wet and average years, and 100 percent over the next 20 years in multiple dry years. With the supplies under development and a projected supply capability of 2,557,300 acre-feet per year (833.3 billion gallons), MWD can meet projected demands beyond the next 20 years (through 2030) even under a repeat of the worst drought conditions. MWD's analysis determined that current practices allow MWD to bring water supplies on line at least ten years in advance of demand; if all imported water supply programs and proposed local projects proceed as planned, with no change in demand projections, water supply reliability could be assured beyond 20 years.

With a projected demand of 425,634 gallons per day, the proposed project does not result in an increase in total water demand in excess of the available water supply. Therefore, although the additional demand created by implementation of the proposed project would constitute an increase in the total water demand, this impact is expected to be less than significant.

Solid Waste

In 2001, the City of La Cañada Flintridge generated a total of 41,397 tons of solid waste; approximately 36,496 tons went to landfills and 8,366 tons were diverted from the waste stream through recycling or provided as biodegradable cover for landfills (green waste or construction/demolition waste). Residential waste accounted for

11,591 tons. Of the total, approximately 45 percent was diverted from the waste stream.² The City has implemented a mandatory green waste separation program effective April 2000 that mandates placement of all green waste in a separate container for curbside collection. The City provides curbside recyclable and household hazardous waste collection as well. For public spaces, grass cycling is implemented, where grass is not allowed to grow past a certain specified height before it is mowed, and the clippings are left on the ground and allowed to mulch rather than be disposed of. Tree trimmings from City-owned property is chipped, mulched, or trimmed as wood for other uses.

La Cañada Flintridge is served primarily by two Class III (non-hazardous) landfills: the Scholl Canyon Landfill and the Puente Hills Landfill, both operated by the County Sanitation Districts. Waste is picked up in the City by private haulers under contract with the City, who then transport the waste to the landfills. The permitted capacity of the Scholl Canyon Landfill is 69 million cubic yards, and as of November 2002 has a remaining permitted capacity of 18.2 million cubic yards (approximately 35 billion tons). Estimated closure date is 2020. Permitted capacity of the Puente Hills Landfill is 106 million cubic yards, with a remaining capacity as of November 2002 of 20 million cubic yards (approximately 38 billion tons). Estimated closure date is 2020 (www.ciwmb.ca.gov).

According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), a standard generation rate of 1 ton per person per year is used to estimate the quantity of solid waste expected under operation of the project. For residential uses, the addition of 17 dwelling units, or 51 persons (using a factor of 3.025 persons per household³), would increase solid waste generation by 51 tons per year, or 0.139 ton per day. This represents less than 0.00001 percent of the total solid waste disposed of per day in the two servicing landfills. While the proposed project would increase the overall generation of solid waste, and the County Sanitation Districts has indicated there is a possibility of a County-wide landfill shortfall as early as 2003 depending on regional growth, there is sufficient capacity available in the Scholl Canyon and Puente Hills Landfills at least through 2020. Alternative disposal options, including additional waste-to-energy facilities and rail disposal options, are currently being explored by the Sanitation Districts to alleviate the potential capacity shortage. In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with the City's Ordinance 9.14 *Recycling and Diversion of Construction and Demolition Debris*, which requires the diversion of at least 50 percent of the total construction and demolition debris generated by a project via reuse or recycling. A Compliance Order dated October 1999 from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) required the City to conduct a Waste Generation Study to establish a more accurate base year and diversion rate. City Staff completed the required study, which was reviewed by the CIWMB. The CIWMB issued a letter that indicates that the City satisfactorily met all the requirements of the Compliance Order. An Extension for compliance with the 50 percent diversion rate mandated by AB 939 has been granted to the City through December 2003. Therefore, as the City is in compliance with AB 939, and it has in place an Ordinance requiring the reuse or recycling of construction-related waste, the impacts of the project on solid waste will be less than significant.

² Data for 2001 have not yet been approved by the California Integrated Waste Management Board. In 2000, the last year for which approval has been obtained, the City diverted 42 percent of the waste stream through recycling.

³ U.S. Census, 2000.

Wastewater

The portion of the proposed project's wastewater would be discharged into the City of Pasadena sewer trunk and treated at either the Whittier Narrows Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) located near the City of South El Monte or the Los Coyotes WRP located in the City of Cerritos. The Whittier Narrows WRP has a design capacity of 15.0 million gallons per day (mgd) and currently processes an average flow of 9.4 mgd; the Los Coyotes WRP has a design capacity of 37.5 mgd, and currently processes an average flow of 36.4 mgd. The additional 3,267 gallons per day that would be treated at these facilities represents less than 0.0001 percent of the remaining wastewater treatment capacity. When the additional five lots are eventually connected to sewer lines within the next ten years, these residences will generate an additional 1,337 gallons of wastewater per day. This increase is negligible compared to the total amount of wastewater discharged through County Sanitation Districts or City of Glendale sewer trunk lines.

Therefore, the proposed project would not generate wastewater that would exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment system in combination with the provider's existing service commitments. This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. A septic system is proposed on lots 9 through 13, for which it is infeasible to connect to the existing sewer infrastructure. With the construction of new sewer assessment districts in the future, these lots may be connected to a City sewer line. However, as no percolation tests have been performed on these lots, the potential for inadequate percolation to accommodate a septic system exists. This impact is also discussed in Section 3.5 (Geology).

■ Potentially Significant Impacts

Impact UTIL-1 The proposed project would require final map and Variance 02-10 approval, construction of water supply, sewer and septic system, natural gas, and electricity infrastructure, and the issuance of a building permit. The construction of the infrastructure could have an adverse effect on the environment. This is considered a *potentially significant* impact.

The proposed project is currently undeveloped and would require various infrastructure extensions for utilities to serve the project site. Alignments for these infrastructure extensions would be in steep slopes and potentially close to a blue-line stream running through the property.

Water lines for the project site would be constructed to connect to the existing water system in surrounding streets. Similarly, telephone, video cable, natural gas, and electrical lines would be installed underground from existing infrastructure in adjacent areas in order to serve the proposed development. These utility extensions would require trenching and excavation, which, as addressed in each corresponding section of this EIR, could have potentially significant environmental impacts on biological resources, geology and soils, and hydrology, as well as noise and air quality impacts from construction activities.

Once repairs to the trunk line have been completed by the City of Pasadena, sewer lines for the western portion of the proposed project would be connected to the City of Pasadena 8-inch sewer trunk running on the western edge of the project site. This would require trenching and excavation, which would result in construction noise and air

quality impacts as noted above. If it is determined that septic systems could be installed on Lots 9 through 13, excavation and the installation of leach fields/percolation areas would be required for those lots on a septic system. However, due to soil properties of Lots 9 through 13, proof of the feasibility of private septic systems is currently lacking, and the potential impacts of this is discussed and addressed in detail under Impact UTIL-3.

All construction impacts are addressed in the respective sections of this Draft EIR and will not be further analyzed here. No new impacts would result specifically from installation of utility infrastructure that have not been addressed in these sections. All construction-related mitigation measures would be implemented to reduce air quality and noise impacts from construction of the utility infrastructure. With the exception of impacts associated with septic systems, all potentially significant impacts with respect to construction and extension of water, natural gas, and electrical infrastructure would be reduced to a *less-than-significant* level with implementation of the appropriate construction mitigation measures as outlined in other sections of this EIR (e.g., Biological Resources and Geology and Soils).

Impact UTIL-2: There is a potential for insufficient wastewater conveyance capacity in the City of Pasadena's Linda Vista/Arroyo Boulevard Sewer Trunk to which the proposed project's sewer infrastructure would connect downstream. Improvements to sewer infrastructure could be required that could result in adverse environmental impacts. This is considered a *potentially significant* impact.

The proposed project would result in an increase in wastewater generation from the additional homes in the area. Estimates of wastewater generation from the proposed project are provided in Table 3.11-4 below.

Table 3.11-4 Estimated Average Wastewater Generation			
<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Persons</i>	<i>Flow per capita (gallons/day)</i>	<i>Approximate Total Flow (gallons/day)</i>
Residential	51	90	4,590

Source: Los Angeles County Bureau of Engineering, Sewer Design Manual, Part F

Wastewater conveyance for five of the 17 lots (9 through 13) is proposed to be achieved through individual septic systems. Each individual septic system would be designed to handle the anticipated wastewater generation from the individual residential unit.

As proposed, 12 lots out of the planned 17 will be connected to the 8-inch City of Pasadena sewer trunk line running beneath Saint Katherine, adjacent to the western boundary of the property. The 12 lots to be connected to the Pasadena trunk line would generate approximately 3,267 gallons per day (based on 12 dwelling units x 3.025 persons per dwelling unit x 90 gallons per capita per day). This represents 0.0008 percent of the total peak flow wastewater generated daily (4.0 million gallons) by the City of Pasadena.⁴

The City of Pasadena's existing lines in Monarch Drive, Bramley Way, and St. Katherine Drive have adequate excess capacity to accommodate sewer flows from the proposed project (City of Pasadena, personal

⁴ Arroyo Seco Master Plan Master EIR, May 16, 2002.

communication, April 2003). As noted in Environmental Setting, the City of La Cañada Flintridge purchased from the City of Pasadena the remaining excess capacity in the Linda Vista/Arroyo Boulevard Trunk Sewer of 3.43 cubic feet per second. Currently, the City of La Cañada Flintridge has not utilized all of its allotted capacity in this trunk sewer. However, with the completion of the City's Sewer Assessment District No. 2, which is currently under construction, the entire allotment may be utilized and no remaining capacity in the Linda Vista/Arroyo Boulevard Trunk Sewer will exist. The 8-inch St. Katherine sewer reach, into which the proposed project's sewer lines would flow, connects to the Linda Vista/Arroyo Boulevard Trunk Sewer. Thus, the contribution of the 3,267 gallons per day from the proposed project is a potentially significant impact given the potential lack of remaining capacity. However, it is anticipated that the proposed project will be allowed to contribute sewer flows into the Linda Vista/Arroyo Boulevard Trunk Sewer provided that the line capacity is increased to accommodate the flows. This would require the Applicant to enter into a third-party agreement with the City of Pasadena and the County Sanitation Districts to provide required infrastructure improvements. Mitigation Measure UTIL-1 provides that the most deficient reach of pipe will be selected and upsized as part of an agreement to connect to the trunk sewer and a proportionate burden of the cost of improvements to the sewer trunk would be borne by the developer. Implementation of this mitigation measure would ensure that this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level. The required improvements would require trenching and construction that could have adverse environmental effects. However, construction impacts are short-term and, with implementation of best management practices, are anticipated to be *less than significant*.

■ Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Impact UTIL-3: Due to the types of soils existing on the site, severe limitations for utilization of septic systems exist on portions of the site. It is unknown at this time if individual septic systems are feasible on Lots 9 through 13. This is a *potentially significant* impact.

As noted in Section 3.5 (Geology), the existence of the Vista-Amargosa soils (thin silty sand over impervious bedrock) on most of the hillsides at the project site, and of alluvium (slightly thicker gravelly sand) in the bottoms of the canyons creates difficulties for the development of septic systems on Lots 9 through 13. The geotechnical report (J. Byer Group, 2001, p.12) states that private disposal systems *may* be feasible for these five lots in the cut portion of the project site that would not be served by the public sewer system. However, as no percolation tests have been performed to date, it is unknown whether the soils on Lots 9 through 13 are capable of supporting individual septic systems. As the project applicant cannot currently demonstrate the feasibility of the seepage pits due to the lack of site-specific absorption capacity values as defined by the Hillside Development Ordinance, or currently provide a viable alternative (e.g., connection to the public sewer system), there is no feasible mitigation and impacts of the proposed private disposal systems would be *significant and unavoidable*. Mitigation Measure UTIL-2 would lessen these impacts.

3.14.5 Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts

MM UTIL-1 Prior to the final map approval, the Applicant shall agree to pay development fees and enter into a third-party agreement with the City of Pasadena and the County Sanitation Districts to provide

any infrastructure improvements requested by the City of Pasadena in exchange for a will-serve agreement to connect to the Linda Vista/Arroyo Boulevard Sewer Trunk.

- MM UTIL-2 Prior to final map approval, the Applicant must obtain all necessary permits to allow septic systems to be installed on lots 9 – 13. This would require the Applicant to demonstrate the feasibility of the septic systems to the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services, and other pertinent regulatory agencies by having a qualified and certified professional perform percolation tests and prepare soil profile reports for the areas to be served by the septic systems

3.14.6 Cumulative Impacts

Infrastructure capacity for utilities and other public services is a regional issue, due to recent and projected population increases in the Southern California area. Implementation of the proposed project could temporarily impact utilities and service systems due to the construction, renovation, or relocation of storm drains, sewage systems, water transport systems, and overhead power and communication lines. However, because construction and renovation activities would be temporary in nature, these impacts would not have a long-term effect.

Wastewater. Cumulative development would result in increased demands on wastewater treatment. However, the project's contribution to cumulative demands would be minor in comparison to regional development. Projected project wastewater generation represents less than 0.0001 percent of the remaining wastewater treatment capacity of the treatment facilities that would serve the project. Therefore, as the Whittier Narrows and Los Coyotes WRPs retain excess capacity, the individual contribution of the proposed project to wastewater treatment on a regional basis would also be less than significant. The City anticipates that wastewater treatment facility capacities are adequate to meet projected demands, and the proposed project would not incrementally contribute to an immediate or foreseeable cumulative impact to wastewater treatment. Therefore, the cumulative impact of the proposed project on wastewater treatment is less than significant. As no excess capacity currently exists in the Linda Vista trunk sewer, into which the proposed project would deposit wastewater, the project's contribution to wastewater conveyance on a cumulative basis could be potentially significant. However, with infrastructure improvements that may be required as part of the conditions of a will-serve commitment from the City of Pasadena for the project, and the future expansion of the City of Pasadena's conveyance capacity that is currently being negotiated, this impact would be reduced to a less-than-significant level, and the project's contribution to cumulative wastewater impacts would also be less than significant.

Water. The MWD, in its February 2002 Report on Metropolitan's Water Supplies, states that its existing supply capabilities can meet 100 percent of its member agencies' projected supplemental demands over the next 20 years in wet and average years, and 100 percent over the next 20 years in multiple dry years. With the supplies under development and a projected supply capability of 2,557,300 acre-feet per year (833.3 billion gallons), MWD can meet projected demands beyond the next 20 years (through 2030) even under a repeat of the worst drought conditions. MWD's analysis determined that current practices allow MWD to bring water supplies on line at least ten years in advance of demand; if all imported water supply programs and proposed local projects proceed as planned, with no change in demand projections, water supply reliability could be assured beyond 20 years. The

proposed project would not contribute to additional water demands beyond growth projections. The City anticipates that water supply is adequate to meet projected demands. No immediate or foreseeable cumulative impacts to water supply are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. No cumulative impacts to water supply providers are anticipated in the short or long term. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Solid Waste. The estimated solid waste generation associated with cumulative development would result in an overall increase in the amount of solid waste generated in the City. The service provider has indicated that current landfill capacity is adequate to accommodate the proposed project's solid waste disposal needs. According to the Los Angeles Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan, 2000 Report, projected remaining permitted capacity in area landfills is 151.43 million tons per year (Class III and unclassified landfills, excluding waste-to-energy facilities). The City currently has an ordinance (Chapter 9.14, *Recycling and Diversion of Construction and Demolition Debris*), which requires the diversion of at least 50 percent of the total construction and demolition debris generated by a project via reuse or recycling. In addition, the City has received an extension through December 2003 to achieve a 50 percent total diversion rate, and is currently in compliance with AB 939. The individual contribution of the proposed project to solid waste generation on a regional basis would be less than significant on a project level. Even with the rate of development in Los Angeles County and the southern California region, the landfills servicing the project area have sufficient capacity to accommodate the solid waste generated by the proposed project in addition to their present and reasonably foreseeable commitments through 2020, the proposed project would not make a cumulatively significant contribution to decrease in landfill capacity, and cumulative impacts to solid waste and solid waste disposal services would be less than significant.

3.14.7 References

- California Integrated Waste Management Board. 2002. Website: www.ciwmb.ca.gov
- Crescenta Valley Water District. 2002. Website: www.cvwd.com
- Crocchi, David. 2002. Personal communication with Valley Water Company, November.
- Gardner, Robert. 2003. Personal communication with City of Pasadena Department of Public Works, March.
- HelpCity.com. 2002. La Cañada Flintridge City Profile. Website: www.helpcity.com/CALaCañada_Flintridge/cityprofile/profile.asp
- Kwan, Yang. 2003. Personal communication with City of La Cañada Flintridge Department of Public Works, April.
- La Cañada Flintridge, City of. 1993. General Plan Land Use and Environmental Resource Management Elements, 1980, 1993.
- . 2003. Municipal Code. Website: <http://ordlink.com/codes/lacanada/index.htm>.
- Los Angeles, County of. 1999. *Planning Department Urban Services Analysis*, March.
- . Bureau of Engineering. *Sewer Design Manual, Part F*.

3.0 Environmental Analysis

- . Sanitation Districts. 2002. *Puente Hills Landfill Brochure*. Website: www.lacsd.org/swaste/Publications/NewPHLFBrochure.htm
- Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District. 2002. *Report on Metropolitan's Water Supplies*, February 11.
- McFarlane, Salvie. 2002. Personal communication with Valley Water Company, November.
- Pasadena, City of. 2002. *Arroyo Seco Master Plan Master EIR*, 16 May.
- . 2003. Personal communication with Robert Gardner, Department of Public Works, March.
- Southern California Association of Governments. 2001. *2001 Regional Transportation Plan Update*.
- Simonian, Sabrina. 2002. Personal communication with Solid Waste Recycling and Disposal, November.